



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,971	11/03/2000	Adrianus J. van den Nieuwelaar	37814/249300	5061
23370	7590	08/15/2003		
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP 1100 PEACHTREE STREET SUITE 2800 ATLANTA, GA 30309			EXAMINER PARSLEY, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT 3643	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/705,971	VAN DEN NIEUWELAAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David J Parsley	3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) Other: ____

Detailed Action

Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment (paper no. 10) dated 7-3-03 and this action is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 9, 12-13, 15-16, 24-25, 31-36, 41-42, 45-46 and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,569,067 to Meyn.

Referring to claims 1 and 31, Meyn discloses a device for processing slaughtered animals or parts thereof, having a first station and a second station comprising, a transfer conveyor which extends between the first station and the second station and which comprises at least one substantially stationary slot – 5 with a width a course, a supply end – proximate 1 and a discharge end, which at least one slot – 5 comprises a first opening at the supply end of the slot and a second opening at the discharge end of the slot, wherein the slot – 5 is designed to carry and support the slaughtered animals or parts thereof – see for example figures 1-8 and columns 1-6. Meyn further discloses supply means – at 1-3 for supplying at the first station slaughtered

animals or parts thereof from a supply conveyor – at 1-2 to the at least one slot of the transfer conveyor, wherein the supply means are adapted to supply only selected slaughtered animals or parts thereof from the supply conveyor to the transfer conveyor and a discharge means for discharging the slaughtered animals or parts thereof from the at least one slot of the transfer conveyor at the second station, wherein the discharge means are adapted to selectively discharge the slaughtered animals or parts from the at least one slot – see for example figures 1-8 and column 6. Meyn further discloses at least one driving member – 10-11 which passes through a path which is substantially parallel to the course of the at least one slot – 5 along the at least one slot from the first station towards the second station, wherein the at least one driving member spans at least half the width of the at least one slot – see for example figures 1-8.

Referring to claims 2 and 32, Meyn discloses the at least one driving member – 10-11 can adopt a first position and a second position, in which the slaughtered animals or parts thereof can and cannot respectively be moved from the first station towards the second station – see for example figures 1-8 and columns 1-6.

Referring to claims 3 and 33, Meyn discloses the at least one driving member – 10-11 can rotate about an axis – at 7 which is substantially perpendicular to the path covered by the at least one driving member – 10-11.

Referring to claims 4 and 34, Meyn discloses the at least one driving member comprises one arm – 10 which is designed to transmit the movement of the at least one driving member to the slaughtered animals or parts thereof.

Referring to claims 5 and 35, Meyn discloses force means – at 13,14 and 17 which exert a force on the at least one driving member at - 16, which force opposes the movement of the at

least one driving member from the first position to the second position – see for example figures 1-8.

Referring to claims 6 and 36, Meyn discloses the force means comprise a spring means – at 17.

Referring to claim 9, Meyn the discharge means are designed to selectively discharge the slaughtered animals or parts thereof from the at least one slot – see for example figures 1-8 and columns 1-6.

Referring to claims 12 and 41, Meyn discloses the supply means and/or discharge means comprises at least one disc – 25 which is driven in rotation and is designed to supply or remove the slaughtered animals or parts thereof one by one to or from the at least one slot – 5, and which is provided on its circumference with at least one holding slot – at 26 which opens out on the outer circumference of the at least one rotatably driven disc and is designed to carry and support at least one slaughtered animal or part of a slaughtered animal – see for example figures 1-8.

Referring to claims 13 and 42, Meyn discloses the rotatably driven disc – 25 has at least two holding slots – at 26 – see for example figures 1-8.

Referring to claims 15 and 44, Meyn discloses the at least one slot – 5 extends substantially in a horizontal plane.

Referring to claims 16 and 45, Meyn discloses the at least one slot – 5 has a substantially curved course – see figure 1.

Referring to claims 24 and 53, Meyn discloses a processing device – 18-19, 23-24 and 27 is provided along the course of the at least one slot – 5 for processing the slaughtered animals or parts thereof.

Referring to claims 25 and 54, Meyn discloses the processing device comprises at least one frictional surface which is arranged along the at least one slot – 5 and is designed to act on part of the slaughtered animals or parts thereof.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-8, 18, 21-23, 37-38, 47 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn as applied to claims 1, 5, 31 and 35 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,813,101 to Brakels et al.

Referring to claims 7 and 37, Meyn does not disclose the force means comprise a controllable piston-cylinder device. Brakels et al. does disclose the force means comprise a controllable piston-cylinder device – at 44 and 50. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the force means comprising a piston-cylinder device of Brakels et al., so as to make the device automatic and easily controllable.

Referring to claims 8 and 38, Meyn as modified by Brakels et al. further discloses the piston/cylinder device – at 44 and 50 can make the at least one driving member – at 34a-34j adopt any desired position between the first position and the second position – see for example

figures 2-3 and columns 3-6 of Brakels et al. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn as modified by Brakels et al. and further add the piston/cylinder causing the driving member to adopt any position of Brakels et al., so as to make the device more flexible and adaptable in that it can be used to place the driving members in any position along the processing path.

Referring to claims 18 and 47, Meyn does not disclose an unloading device is provided inside the slot. Brakels et al. does disclose an unloading device – at 42 and 48 is provided inside the slot – see for example figures 1-8. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the unloading device inside the slot of Brakels et al., so as to allow for a quick and efficient unloading of the slaughtered animals from the device.

Referring to claims 21 and 50, Meyn does not disclose unloading-control means are provided for controlling the unloading device. Brakels et al. does disclose unloading-control means are provided for controlling the unloading device at 42 and 48 – see for example columns 3-6. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the control means of Brakels et al., so as to automate the device to make it more efficient and quicker.

Referring to claims 22-23 and 51-52, Brakels et al. discloses a weighing device – 9 in a different location than the applicant. This does not create a patentable distinction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to simply move the weighing means from one location to another. See *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 86 USPQ 70, 73 (CCPA 1950).

Art Unit: 3643

Brakels further discloses a weighing and grading station on a poultry transfer device that transmits data to eject the poultry based on the data gained – see column 3 lines 23-35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the weighing and ejection stations of Brakels et al. with the device of Meyn to enable the sorting of poultry at the transfer stage.

Claims 10-13 and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn as applied to claims 1, 9 and 31 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,453,045 to Hobbel et al.

Referring to claims 10 and 39, Meyn does not disclose the supply means comprise a switching mechanism which can be moved into a first switched position and a second switched position, in which the slaughtered animals or parts thereof are and are not respectively supplied to at least one slot. Hobbel et al. does disclose the supply means – at 11 and 14 comprise a switching mechanism, which can be moved into a first switched position and a second switched position, in which the slaughtered animals or parts thereof are and are not respectively supplied to at least one slot – see for example columns 1-10. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the supply means with first and second switched positions of Hobbel et al., so as to automate the device so as to make the process quicker and more efficient.

Referring to claims 11 and 40, Meyn does not disclose the supply means and/or the discharge means are controlled by supply-control means on the basis of data relating to the slaughtered animals or parts thereof to be transferred. Hobbel et al. does disclose the supply means and/or the discharge means are controlled by supply-control means on the basis of data relating to the slaughtered animals or parts thereof to be transferred – see for example columns 1-

Art Unit: 3643

10. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the supply and discharge controlled by data relating to the slaughtered animal of Hobbel et al., so as to make the device quicker and more efficient in that it can function and be controlled in relation to the slaughtered animals.

Referring to claims 12 and 41, Hobbel et al. further discloses the supply means – at 14 and the discharge means – at 19 comprise at least one disc which is driven in rotation and is designed to supply or remove the slaughtered animals or parts thereof one by one to or from the at least one slot and which is provided on its circumference with at least one holding slot which opens out on the outer circumference with at least one holding slot which opens out on the outer circumference of the at least one rotatably driven disc and is designed to carry and support at least one slaughtered animal or part of a slaughtered animal – see for example figures 1-2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the rotatably driven supply and/or discharge discs of Hobbel et al., so as to allow for quick sequential loading and discharge of the slaughtered animals while keeping the device compact taking up a smaller area in the processing plant.

Referring to claims 13 and 42, Hobbel et al. further discloses the rotatably driven discs – at 14 and 19 have at least two holding slots – see for example figures 1-2. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the discs having at least two holding slots of Hobbel et al., so as to allow for the device to process more carcasses quicker.

Claims 14 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn or Meyn as modified by Hobbel et al. as applied to claims 12 and 41 above, and further in view

of EP Patent No. 819382 to Bos et al. Meyn and Hobbel et al. further disclose the at least one rotatably driven disc – 25 of Meyn and – 19 of Hobbel et al. of the discharge means transfers the slaughtered animals or parts thereof. Meyn and Hobbel et al. do not disclose the discharge means transfers the slaughtered animals into a stationary waiting slot. Bos et al. does disclose the discharge means – at 46,48,52,54 transfers the slaughtered animals or parts thereof into a stationary waiting slot – 30 – see for example figure 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn or Meyn as modified by Hobbel et al. and add the discharge means transferring the slaughtered animal into a stationary slot of Bos et al., so as to allow for a smooth transition after the discharge means in that the slot is stationary and not moving with respect to the discharge means.

Claims 17 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn as applied to claims 1 and 31 above, and further in view of Bos et al. Meyn does not disclose the at least one slot has a substantially straight course. Bos et al. does disclose the at least one slot – at 12 has a substantially straight course – see for example figure 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn and add the slot being straight of Bos et al., so as to allow for the slaughtered animals to be transferred along the slot more efficiently in that it is less likely that the slaughtered animal gets snagged along the slot.

Claims 19-20 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn as modified by Brakels et al. as applied to claims 18 and 47 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,254,472 to Meyn.

Referring to claims 19 and 48, Meyn '067 as modified by Brakels et al. does not disclose the unloading device is designed to locally widen the at least one slot. Meyn '472 does disclose

the unloading device at – 18, 25 and 19,26 is designed to locally widen the at least one slot – see for example figure 1 and columns 4-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 as modified by Brakels et al. and add the unloading device designed to locally widen the at least one slot of Meyn '472, so as to allow for quick and efficient unloading of the slaughtered animal by using automatic controls.

Referring to claims 20 and 49, Meyn '067 as modified by Brakels et al. and Meyn '472 further discloses the unloading device – at 18,25 and 19,26 comprises defines a section – 25 and 26 which defines a section of the at least one slot and can move substantially transversely with respect to the course of the slot, for locally increasing the width of the slot – see for example figure 1 and columns 4-5 of Meyn '472. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 as modified by Brakels et al. and Meyn '472 and add the section of Meyn '472, so as to allow for quick and efficient unloading of the slaughtered animal by using automatic controls.

Claims 26-29 and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn '067 as applied to claims 25 and 54 above, and further in view of Meyn '472.

Referring to claims 26 and 55, Meyn '067 does not disclose the frictional device forms part of a driven conveyor belt. Meyn '472 does disclose the frictional device is a conveyor belt – 1-4. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 and add the frictional device forming a conveyor belt of Meyn '472, so as to affect quick and accurate movement of the slaughtered animals.

Referring to claims 27 and 56, Meyn '067 does not disclose two conveyor belts on either side of the slot for clamping the slaughtered animal. Meyn '472 does disclose two conveyor belts

Art Unit: 3643

– 1-2 and 3-4 on either side of the slot for clamping the slaughtered animal – see for example figure 1. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 and add the frictional device forming two conveyor belts of Meyn '472, so as to affect quick and accurate movement of the slaughtered animals.

Referring to claims 28 and 57, Meyn '472 further discloses two driven conveyors – at 1-4 and the hanging conveyor – see columns 1-5, which are arranged one behind the other along the at least one slot – see for example figure 1 and columns 1-5. Meyn '472 does not disclose the overhead conveyor comprises a conveyor belt but it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Meyn '472 to include a belt on the overhead conveyor to affect motion of the slaughtered animal. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 and add the two conveyors arranged behind each other of Meyn '472, so as to affect quick and accurate movement of the slaughtered animals.

Referring to claims 29 and 58, Meyn '472 further discloses the direction of movement of a first conveyor belt – 1 (counter clockwise) differs from that of a second conveyor belt – 2 (clockwise). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 and add the conveyor belts moving in different directions of Meyn '472, so as to securely hold the slaughtered animal as it is being conveyed in the slot.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyn '067 in view of Meyn '472 as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Hobbel et al. Meyn '067 as modified by Meyn '472 does not disclose a first and second conveyor move at different speeds. Hobbel et al. does disclose two conveyors moving at different speeds – see for example column 3 lines 26-32 and figure 1. Hobbel et al. does not disclose the conveyors comprise

conveyor belts but instead conveyor chains, but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a conveyor belt instead of a chain to affect the movement of the animal parts as a matter of design choice. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the device of Meyn '067 and Meyn '472 and add the conveyors moving at differing speeds of Hobbel et al., so as to make the device adjustable for differing situations and processing conditions.

Response to Arguments

4. Regarding claim 1, applicant states that the supply means are item – 3 of the Meyn '067 reference, however as seen in the previous office action (paper no. 9) the supply means is shown as items 1-3.

Further, the Meyn '067 does disclose that selected animals or parts thereof are transferred from the supply means to the transfer conveyor as seen in figures 1-8 and column 6 where the selected parts of the animal are the entrails. Other parts of the animal are not transferred and conveyed and therefore only the entrails are selected over other parts of the animal.

Further, the entire disclosure of Meyn '067 as seen in figures 1-8 and columns 1-6 show or discuss that only the entrails of the animal are transferred and conveyed by the device and therefore there are multiple references of the Meyn '067 reference to only the entrails being transferred and conveyed throughout the drawings and disclosure with a few of these references being shown in figures 7-8 and column 3 lines 64-67 and column 4 lines 1-10.

Regarding claim 2, the Meyn '067 reference does disclose the driving member – at 10 adopts a position where parts of the animal cannot be moved from the first station to the second

Art Unit: 3643

station. As seen in column 4 lines 27-28 and column 5 lines 53-67 the driving member – at 10 has a variable length which can be changed and therefore the extended length of the driving member is a position which engages the animal and the retracted length is a different position which does not engage the animal and thus depending on the length of the driving member the animal is either engaged or not. Further as seen in figure 1 the slot – at 5 does not completely extend around the entire path traveled by the driving member – at 10 and therefore when the drive member is conveying the animal in the slot it engages the animal, and after the animal is discharged from the slot and before the driving member engages a new animal the driving member is not engaging an animal and therefore the driving member is moved into two different positions either engaging or not engaging the animal.

Regarding claim 31, the Meyn '067 reference does disclose the parts of the animal being the entrails are selectively discharged from the slot as seen in column 1 lines 24-43 which states that the entrails package is broken into different packages as the animal is processed as it is conveyed along the slot and therefore a selected portion of the animal is discharged.

Further, the Meyn '067 reference does disclose a means for discharging as seen in column 6 lines 25-27, which states that the portions of the animal are discharged in an appropriate way, and therefore a means for discharging is inherently taught. Further, as seen in figures 6-8 a means for removing portions of the animal from the slot – 5 is shown where the liver – 22 of the animal is removed from being conveyed by the slot – 5 when it is cut by knife – 23 and placed on supporting plate – at 20.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to David Parsley whose telephone number is (703) 306-0552. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon, can be reached at (703) 308-2574.

